

## REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed July 30, 2003. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application.

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 12, and 25 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. New claims 27-30 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-30 are presented for examination.

Claims 2 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended claim 5 to overcome the lack antecedent basis.

With respect to Claim 2, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner misunderstood the meaning of the limitation added in claim 2. Claim 2 added the separate, additional element of "displaying a plurality of results on a single page with no sponsors." This is a separate element from "incorporating a designated web page of a sponsor on the same page as the search result" claimed in claim 1. Therefore, since no "optionality" or "alternatives" are presented in this instance, but rather a specific limitation is added to the limitations in claim 1, Applicant believes that that the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph are met, and requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Examiner rejected claims 12-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,487,538 issued to Gupta, et al. (hereinafter "Gupta"). Gupta discusses enabling an Internet service provider (ISP) to substitute banner advertising in content being served to an end user. The Examiner refers to Abstract and Column 4, lines 14-65. However, those portions specifically recites a banner or icon as an advertisement, teaching away from this

invention. Gupta specifically addresses the format of the advertisements only in the background, by stating that they are standard click-through advertisements. (column 4, lines 19-25).

Claim 12, on the other hand, recites:

A method comprising:  
permitting purchase a sponsorship of at least one listing  
based on a criteria; and  
identifying a designated web page for incorporation on the  
same page as the listing when the sponsored listing is displayed as  
a search result, the designated web page being fully browseable to  
a user viewing the sponsored listing.

(Claim 12, as amended). Gupta does not teach or including a fully browseable designated web page with a listing. Rather, Gupta specifically teaches away from this, by discussing click-through banner advertising. Banner advertising, or click-through advertising, generally displays an image such as a JPEG, and if the user navigates onto the banner, and clicks the mouse, a new web page is opened. This new web page is the advertiser's web page.

In contrast, the web page of the sponsor of the present invention as described in claim 12 is displayed on the same page as the listing of a sponsoree, i.e. the listing associated with that particular sponsor. The web page is the fully navigable browseable web page of the sponsor. Thus, a user does not need to click-through to the sponsor's web page, but rather needs to click-off to leave the sponsor's web page. Note that unlike pop-up advertising, in accordance with the present invention, the sponsor's web page is displayed with the requested listee-sponsoree information. Therefore, the user cannot close the window without glancing at it. Furthermore, Yahoo and other search engines only return hyperlinks, banners, and advertisements. None of the search engines return a search result i.e. listee-sponsoree with a designated web page of its sponsor on the same page as the search result. Yahoo, or any other search engine cannot implement the technique claimed in claim 12 without also

defining a listee-sponsor relationship. None of the prior art references define such a relationship.

Gupta does not teach or suggest such a relationship between listee-sponsoree and a sponsor, nor the incorporation of an active browseable web page with a listing. Therefore, claim 12, and claims 13-24 which depend on it are not anticipated by Gupta.

Claim 25, as amended, recites:

An apparatus for showing search results comprising:  
a database including a plurality of searchable listee-sponsoree listings;  
a user interface for receiving a search from a user;  
a searching logic for searching the plurality of listee-sponsoree listings in response to the search;  
a linking logic for linking a listee-sponsoree result of the search to a sponsor; and  
the user interface for displaying data of the listee-sponsoree that is the result of the search and incorporating a designated fully navigable web page of the sponsor on the same page as the result.

(Claim 25, as amended). As noted above, Gupta does not teach or suggest an association between a listee-sponsoree and a sponsor, nor does Gupta teach or suggest incorporating a fully navigable web page on the same page as a search result. Therefore, Gupta does not anticipate or make claim 25 obvious.

Examiner rejected claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,256,623 issued to Jones and further in view of Gupta. Jones discusses the use of a search clip to provide a consistent user interface and a consistent set of rules for searching varying web-based search services. Search clips are searchable (i.e. they can be accessed with a keyword search). They may also be displayed "in-place" on a web page. Jones only discusses advertising with respect to Figure 5, where Jones states that "Other frames, such as those containing advertising at 540 are still visible if desired." (Jones, column 9, lines 10-11). As can be seen in Figure 5 of Jones, the

advertising (540) is a small display such as a small banner ad. Jones does not teach or suggest incorporating a web page of a sponsor into a listing.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:  
permitting a search;  
displaying a search result; and  
incorporating a designated active and browseable web page of a sponsor on the same page as the search result.

(Claim 1, as amended). Neither Jones nor Gupta teach or suggest incorporating an active and browseable web page with a listee-sponsoree search result. Rather, both references teach away from such incorporation. Jones discusses a small advertising which may be incorporated with a set of search results. Gupta discusses using the existing banner ads in a web page, and substituting advertising from the ISP instead of the preexisting advertising. Therefore, neither Jones nor Gupta teach or suggest incorporating an active browseable web page with a search result. Therefore, claims 1 and 2 are not obvious over Jones in view of Gupta.

Examiner rejected claims 3-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones in view of Gupta as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Leal, U.S. Patent No. 6,189,003. Leal discusses an online business directory with predefined search template for facilitating the matching of buyers to qualified sellers. Leal enables the use of “enhanced” data for a Yellow pages or similar service. Leal does not discuss sponsors associated with particular listee-sponsoree listings. Furthermore, although Examiner suggests that Leal leaves off a telephone number from a listing, in fact, Leal appears to teach the exact opposite. Leal specifically states that “the user can make a call on their own” (column 11, lines 2-5). This clearly indicates that the listener’s telephone number is included in the data presented to the user, otherwise the

user could not directly call the listed. Therefore, Leal does not teach or suggest leaving off essential data from a listing, as recited in claim 3.

Furthermore, Leal does not cure the deficiencies of Gupta and Jones, since Leal does not teach or suggest incorporating a navigable web page of a sponsor with the listener's data. Therefore, for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 3-11 are not obvious over the combination of Jones, Gupta, and Leal.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Judith A. Szepesi at (408) 720-8598.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/1 2003



Judith A. Szepesi  
Reg. No, 39,393

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(408) 720-8598